REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 25, 2006 has been received and considered. In this response, claim 24 has been amended. Support for the amendment may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowance of Claims

The applicant notes with appreciation that claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-15, and 17-23 are allowed.

Objection to Specification

At page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to because of the following alleged informalities: "Summary of the Invention" is missing. 37 C.F.R. 1.73 reads as follows (emphasis added):

> A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, *should* precede the detailed description. Such summary *should, when set forth,* be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed.

The language is permissive, allowing, but not requiring, a Summary of the Invention. Accordingly, the lack of a section titled "Summary of the Invention" is permitted under 37 C.F.R. 1.73.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the disclosure is improper and withdrawal of this objection therefore is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 24-30, 32

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 24-30, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 24 has been amended to include generating a re-sampled pixel by applying the normalized alpha value, and as such is not a mathematical algorithm or equation. Claims 25-30, and 32 depend from claim 24.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 24-30, 32 is improper and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 24, 28, 32, 34-37

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 24, 28, 32, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Betrisey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,023) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 24 recites receiving an absolute alpha value, wherein the absolute alpha value represents a position, within a first range of alpha values, related to a first pixel source. This element is not disclosed or suggested by Betrisey. Betrisey discloses a method for displaying a character on a display screen by changing "alpha values" associated with the relative luminous intensity of the character and the character background. *Betrisey*, col. 3, lines 18-64. According to Betrisey,

> Alpha values indicate the proportion of the foreground and the background color which contribute to the image area to which the alpha value corresponds. In the know system a single alpha value is generated for each pixel and is used to control the red, green and blue *luminous intensity* values of the pixel as a function of foreground and background colors which are subsequently applied.

Id., col. 3, lines 41-47 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the alpha values disclosed in Betrisey represent a *luminous intensity*, rather than a *position* of a pixel as recited in claim 24.

Page 8 of the Office Action, asserts that Betrisey discloses alpha values representing position, and as support quotes Betrisey "*the alpha values associated with pixel sub-components* at or near the position of the character features *are increased to give the appearance of larger dimensions of the character features and greater contrast in the displayed image*" *Id.*, Abstract (emphasis added). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited passage of Betrisey states that the alpha values represent intensity. Betrisey states that the alpha value of pixels at particular positions are altered, but nowhere discloses that the alpha values themselves represent a position as recited in claim 24. Thus, Betrisey teaches that alpha values represent the relative luminosity values of pixel sub-components and not position of pixel sub-components.

As explained, Betrisey fails to disclose or suggest alpha values representing a position of a pixel. Accordingly, Betrisey necessarily fails to disclose or suggest receiving absolute alpha values, *wherein the absolute alpha value represents a position,* within a first range of alpha

values, relative to a first source pixel as recited in claim 24. Further more, Betrisey necessarily fails to disclose or suggest normalizing the amplified alpha value to generate a normalized alpha value so that the normalized alpha value *represents a position* of a re-sampled pixel relative to the first range of alpha values.

Further, Claim 24 recites amplifying the absolute alpha value by a factor to generate an amplified alpha value. This element is not disclosed or suggested by Betrisey. Betrisey discloses a method for filtering the value associated with each pixel. *Betrisey*, col 3, lines 28-39. According to Betrisey,

> Given the above described filtering process, if a character is very thin, e.g., 1/6 of a pixel wide at a particular scan line, then only one sample of the six-times over sampled scan-line will be "on", e.g., correspond to the foreground color. This sample, after the filtering, will produce alpha values that are no more than 1 (on a scale from 0-6). If the background is white and the foreground is black, the pixel representing the character will not be more than 1/6 gray. *Id.*, col. 15, lines 1-9.

Accordingly, the filtering disclosed in Betrisey does not represent amplifying the alpha value, because "…the filtering, will produce alpha values that are no more than 1…." *Id.*, col. 15, lines 5-6. When the alpha values are manipulated as described above and the result is "…no more than 1…" there is no amplification of the alpha value. Accordingly, Betrisey fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 24.

Claims 28, 32, and 34-37 depend from claim 24. Accordingly, Betrisey fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 24. In addition, these claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 24, 28, 32, and 34-37 are improper at this time and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 31, 33-37

The Office Action Summary indicates claims 31 and 33-37 are objected to, but the reason for the objection is not noted in the Office Action.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 31 and 33-37 is improper at this time and withdrawal of this objection therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/   November 22, 2006
Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146   Date
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 W. Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)